

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

Claim 8 has been canceled. Claims 1, 10, 15, 18, and 21 have been amended.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Reimer (US 5,019,939). Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been overcome by the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 10, 15, 18, and 21. Amended Claim 1 includes the feature of "one or more recesses at least partially defined by at least one of said fins, the recesses having a depth smaller than the height of said fins" (emphasis added). Amended Claim 18 includes the feature of "one or more slots at least partially defined by at least one of said fins, the slots having a depth smaller than the height of said fins" (emphasis added). Amended Claims 10, 15, and 21 all include a similar feature. A benefit of these features is that each of the one or more recesses or slots has a depth sufficient to support a circuit card without interfering with components mounted on the circuit card. These amendments are supported in Applicants' specification at least at page 4, lines 3-12 and in Figure 1. No new matter has been introduced.

By contrast, these features are not taught or suggested in Reimer. Reimer teaches away from these features at least in Figure 1 and Figure 3.

Furthermore, Applicants' invention as recited in Claims 1, 10, 15, 18, and 21 includes the feature of one or more recesses or slots for supporting or guiding a circuit card, the recesses or slots at least partially defined by heat dissipating fins. By contrast, Reimer does not teach or suggest this feature. Reimer discloses heat dissipation from "a series of finned surfaces 2 and 3" (col. 3, lines 13-17) and "heat dissipation . . . occurs at the four finned areas 8, 9, 18, and 19 . ." (col. 3, lines 28-30). As shown in Reimer's Figure 1 and Figure 2, the heat dissipating structures 2, 3, 8, 9, 18, and 19, do not support or guide a circuit card. Those structures in Reimer which are in contact with a circuit card are disclosed as "thermal path connectors, such as 4" (col. 3 lines 18-20) or "a combination locator and thermal path unit such as 35 and 36" (col. 3, lines 52-54). Applicants respectfully submit that "thermal path connectors" and

"combination locator and thermal path unit" are distinct from, and do not anticipate, Applicants' invention as claimed in Claims 1, 10, 15, 18, and 21.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 1, 10, 15, 18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-7 and 9 are properly dependent, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 1. Claims 11-14 are properly dependent, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 10. Claims 16 and 17 are properly dependent, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 15. Claims 19 and 20 are properly dependent, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 18. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 2-7, 9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn and the claims allowed for at least the same reasons as those set forth above with respect to Claims 1, 10, 15, 18, and 21.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reimer in view of Atkinson et al. (US 6,680,849). Applicants respectfully submit that rejection of Claim 2 is overcome at least by the amendment to Claim 1.

Section 2143 of the MPEP states:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.
(Emphasis added.)

Claim 1, as amended, includes the feature of "one or more recesses at least partially defined by at least one of said fins, the recesses having a depth smaller than the height of said fins." Support for this amendment is put forth above. Amended Claim 1 includes features not taught or suggested in Reimer, as put forth above.

Claim 2 is properly dependent on Claim 1 and therefore incorporates all the features of Claim 1 by reference. Therefore, Reimer does not teach or suggest all features of Claim 2. Atkinson does not remedy this deficiency.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been overcome by the above amendments and arguments and that Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Joshua L. Cohen

Joshua L. Cohen, Reg. No. 38,040
Attorney for Applicants

Mitchell D. Hirsch, Reg. No. 54,170
Registered Patent Agent for Applicants

JLC/MDH/jal

Dated: January 17, 2006

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

1/17/06
Joshua L. Cohen
